REMARKS

The Office Action of November 13, 2009, has been carefully studied. Claims 1-4, 6-14, 17 and 18 currently appear in this application. Claims 7-12, 17 and 18 have been withdrawn. These claims define novel and unobvious subject matter under Sections 102 and 103 of 35 U.S.C., and therefore should be allowed. Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and formal allowance of the claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to recite "a die lip" rather than "the die lip", and claim 3 has been amended to recite "a resin melt supply duct..."

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the melt viscosity difference between resin A and resin B is at most 3000 poises.

Art Rejections

Claims 1-4, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kagasawa et al., US 2004/0108621 in view of Kagasawa et al., US 2002/0112813.

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kagasawa '621 teaches that "the larger the difference in extrusion rate between the resin in the middle and the resin for the edge portions becomes, the more the disorder is likely to occur at the boundary between the resins." However, if the degree of enclosing is increased with the increase in the difference in extrusion rate, the disorder at the boundary can be reduced. [paragraph 0013]

Additionally, Kagasawa '813 teaches that "a resin film forming method for extruding fused resin from an extruder die to form a resin film, wherein a resin forming both ends in which direction of the resin film has an MFR smaller than that of a resin forming a center in width direction of the resin film." [claim 3]

It is respectfully submitted that Kagasawa '813 teaches that it is essential for the resin in the middle to be enclosed by the resin that forms the edge portions. That is, Kagasawa '813 positively teaches a method for producing the lapping part of the thermoplastic resin and the other thermoplastic resin.

In contrast thereto, the presently claimed method is designed to minimize the lapping part, so that the part "**the cross-sectional shape of an unstretched film is formed by thermoplastic resin A and the thermoplastic resin B coexists on both sides of thermoplastic resin A and the width of the thermoplastic resin B is substantially uniform in the cross direction of the unstretched film**," as recited in amended claim 1. Support for this amendment can be found in Figure 6 and paragraph [0039] of the specification as filed.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kagasawa et al., US 2004/0108621 in view of Kagasawa et al., US 2002/0112813 and further in view of Thompson, US 4,272,312.

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The fact that Thompson teaches that the second resin can be provided with a dye so that the edge portion can be removed readily adds nothing to the combination of Kagasawa '521 and Kagasawa '813. There is nothing in either Kagasawa application that teaches or suggests that the cross-sectional shape of the unstretched film is formed by thermoplastic resin A and thermoplastic resin B coexisting on both sides of thermoplastic resin A, and the width of thermoplastic resin B is substantially uniform in the cross direction of the unstretched film.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are now in condition for allowance, and favorable action thereon is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By _____

Anne M. Kornbau
Registration No. 25,884

AMK:srd
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\0\Ohta\Fujii10\Pto\2010-02-12RCEAmendment.doc